



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

11/761,549

06/12/2007

William Stanton

MI22-3535

1182

21567 7590 10/09/2013  
Wells St. John P.S.  
601 West First Avenue  
Suite 1300  
Spokane, WA 99201-3828

EXAMINER

JELSMA, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1721

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/09/2013

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* WILLIAM STANTON and FEI WANG

---

Appeal 2012-005217  
Application 11/761,549  
Technology Center 1700

---

Before BRADLEY R. GARRIS, CHARLES F. WARREN, and  
KAREN M. HASTINGS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) listed below:<sup>1</sup>

claims 11-15, 17, and 25 as unpatentable over the combined prior art of Tu and Lee with either of Gorski or Volk;

claim 26 over the combined prior art of Tu and Lee with either of Gorski or Volk, and further with Eggers; and,

claim 36 as unpatentable over the combined prior art of Tu, Kalk, Tan, and Otani.<sup>2</sup>

Upon consideration of the evidence on this record and each of Appellants' contentions, we find that the preponderance of evidence on this record supports the Examiner's conclusion that the subject matter of Appellants' claims is unpatentable. We sustain the above rejections based on the detailed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and thorough rebuttals to arguments<sup>3</sup> expressed by the Examiner in the Answer.

Indeed, Appellants did not present any specific arguments to contest the Examiner's § 103 rejections 11-15, 17, 25, and 26 based on Tu and Lee with Volk (Ans. 9-12, 18-22; Brief *generally*).

The decision of the Examiner is affirmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Examiners Answer p. 4 for a listing of the references relied upon in the rejections.

<sup>2</sup> Appellants' arguments are presented on the five pages of Section VII, labeled "ARGUMENT.". The Brief contains no page numbers.

<sup>3</sup> No Reply Brief has been filed.

Appeal 2012-005217  
Application 11/761,549

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED

cam